

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|-------------------------|---|----------------------|-------------------------|------------------|
| 09/507,428 | 02/19/2000 | Todd M. Spencer | 10991108-1 | 1394 |
| 22879 | 7590 10/06/2004 | | EXAMINER | |
| HEWLETT PACKARD COMPANY | | | DINH, DUNG C | |
| | 2400, 3404 E. HARMON TUAL PROPERTY ADM | | ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
| FORT COLI | NS, CO 80527-2400 | | 2152 | |
| | | | DATE MAILED: 10/06/200- | 4 |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

| | Application No. | Applicant(s) | | | | |
|---|-----------------------------------|---------------------------------|-----|--|--|--|
| Advisory Action | 09/507,428 | SPENCER ET AL. | | | | |
| | Examiner | Art Unit | | | | |
| | Dung Dinh | 2152 | | | | |
| The MAILING DATE of this communication appe | ars on the cover sheet with the c | orrespondence addre | ess | | | |
| THE REPLY FILED 03 August 2004 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. | | | | | | |
| PERIOD FOR REPLY [check either a) or b)] | | | | | | |
| a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of the final rejection. b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection. ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f). Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any eamed patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). | | | | | | |
| A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. | | | | | | |
| 2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because: | | | | | | |
| (a) ☐ they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below); | | | | | | |
| (b) they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below); | | | | | | |
| (c) ☐ they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or | | | | | | |
| (d) they present additional claims without canceliNOTE: | ng a corresponding number of fi | nally rejected claims | | | | |
| 3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following reject | ion(s): | | | | | |
| 4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s). | | | | | | |
| 5. ☐ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☐ request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: See Continuation Sheet. | | | | | | |
| 6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection. | | | | | | |
| 7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(s) a) will not be entered or b) will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended. | | | | | | |
| The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: | | | | | | |
| Claim(s) allowed: | | | | | | |
| Claim(s) objected to: <u>20-22,24,26-28,30,32-34 and 36</u> . | | | | | | |
| Claim(s) rejected: <u>19,23,25,29,31 and 35</u> . | | | | | | |
| Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: | | | | | | |
| 8. The drawing correction filed on is a) approved or b) disapproved by the Examiner. | | | | | | |
| 9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s)(PTO-1449) Paper No(s) | | | | | | |
| 10. Other: | | | | | | |
| | | Dung Dinh | | | | |
| | | Primary Examiner Art Unit: 2152 | | | | |

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: the examiner maintains that Hao's teaching of ensuring consistency prior to permitting further modification constitutes the verification step as claimed because Hao 'ensuring' and the claimed 'verifying' is done essentially the same way - i.e. correlating of the window indexes.

Regarding claim 22 and 23, claim 22 depends upon claim 21 which were objected to being allowable if rewritten in independent form including the limitation of all intervening claims. Hence, claim 22 is objected to also. As per claim 23, claim 23 is rejected under 102(e) in view of Hao in the office action. The examiner mistakenly put 24 in the rejection header. However, the body of the rejection clearly addressed claim 23.